UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,110	08/04/2003	Dave Porter	032234.05Porter	6387

7590 09/26/2005

Henry S. Jaudon
McNair Law Firm, P.A.
P.O. Box 10827
Greenville, SC 29603

EXAMINER	
HUNNINGS, TRAVIS R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2632	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/634,110	PORTER, DAVE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Travis R. Hunnings	2632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 July 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 July 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayor (US Patent 6,737,962) in view of Alton (US Patent 3,594,752).

Regarding claim 1, Mayor discloses the following claimed limitations:

The claimed housing having first and second ends carried by said container, said first end being disposed within said container, and said second end being disposed outside said container is met by the housing containing the alarm module (col. 4, lines 17-42);

The claimed sensor carried within said first end of said housing for monitoring conditions within said container and signaling changes in said conditions is met by the sensors such as the unauthorized connect sensor, door sensors, etc. (col. 4, lines 17-42);

The claimed external status indicator carried within said second end of said housing for signaling current security status of the container is met by the strobe light (col. 4, lines 17-42);

The claimed indicator having a first condition visually signaling a secured status within said container and a second condition visually signaling detection of a breach is met by the strobe light having on and off settings that display the current status of the alarm module to the operator (col. 3, lines 38-67);

The claimed central processing unit carried within said housing in communication with said sensor and said status indicator said central processing unit receiving information monitored by said sensor; comparing said information against a set of established parameters and signaling said status indicator detection of a breach of said parameters is met by the alarm module connected to the sensors and operative to determine if an alarm state has occurred according to the signals received from the sensors (col. 3, lines 38.54);

The claimed remote access device operatively associated with said sensor for deactivating and reactivating said sensor is met by the remote FOB that is used to receive information regarding the alarm module status and to arm/disarm the alarm module device (col. 13, lines 20-24);

The claimed security system providing a first visual signal on the exterior of the container when the conditions within the container are within said parameters and a secured visual signal when said parameters have been breached indicating tampering or unauthorized access into said container is met by the strobe light being off when the alarm module has not been activated and the strobe light being on when the alarm module has been activated (col. 3, lines 38-67).

However, Mayor does not specifically disclose the claimed structure of the device being all contained in a singular housing, mounted through the side wall of a container with the indicator located on the outside of the container and the sensor located on the interior end of the housing inside the container. Alton discloses *Condition Sensing And Alarm Unit And Circuit Therefor* that teaches a trailer container sensing system that is mounted through the sidewall of the container with an indicator on the outside and a sensor located on the interior of the housing which is on the inside of the container as shown in figures 1 and 3 (abstract). Modifying the device of Mayor to consolidate all the components into a singular housing that is mounted through the sidewall of the container would reduce the costs of installation because only one part would need to be installed instead of multiple. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device disclosed by Mayor according to the teachings of Alton to use the particular housing and mounting arrangements taught.

Regarding claim 2, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed security system wherein said processing unit includes a computer readable medium for defining the type change within said container and the date and time of said change is met by the event memory of the alarm module recording the events that occur in the alarm module (Mayor: col. 10, lines 29-38).

Regarding claim 3, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed security system wherein said change may constitute a change in light conditions, temperature, motion, sound, radiation and any combination thereof is met by the door sensors sensing motion of the doors (Mayor: col. 3, lines 38-54 and col. 4, lines 17-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any combination of sensors to accomplish the task of securing the trailer including light, temperature, motion, sound and radiation.

Regarding claim 4, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed security system wherein said remote access device is operative to receive, display and print condition information generated by said processing unit is met by the alarm module transmitting information regarding the status of the alarm module to a remote monitoring station that may be a PDA or laptop computer that may print out the information regarding the events reported (Mayor: col. 8, lines 62-67, col. 9, lines 1-4 and 58-67).

Regarding claim 5, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed security system wherein said remote accessing device includes a global positioning system whereby said remote access device is operative to generate location at the time of breach is met by the alarm module retrieving GPS data at the time the alarm system has been triggered and sending that information to the remote processing center (Mayor: col. 9, lines 5-13). Altering the device to make the remote device

retrieve the GPS data instead of automatically retrieving the data upon the occurrence of an alarm state would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in order to be able to retrieve trailer location data at other times rather than only at alarm conditions.

Regarding claim 6, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed security system wherein said external status indicator includes indicator lights is met by the strobe light (Mayor: col. 4, lines 17-42).

Regarding claim 7, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed security system including a power source for operating said sensing unit is met by the battery providing power to the alarm system (Mayor: col. 3, lines 26-53).

Regarding claim 8, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed security system wherein said housing is removably mounted in an end wall or door of said container is met by the housing being mounted as seen in figures 1 and 3 of Alton.

Regarding claim 9, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed security system wherein said container is portable by land and sea transport is met by the trailer being transported by land carriers as seen in figure 3 of Mayor (i.e.

tractor-trailers) and it is well known that tractor trailer containers can be transported by rail or sea using well known transportation techniques.

Regarding claim 10, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed security system wherein said second end includes an infrared port for receiving and transmitting information is met by the system transmitting information over an infrared channel (Mayor: col. 4, lines 59-67, col. 5, lines 1-6, col. 10, lines 58-67 and col. 11, lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 11, Mayor has the following claimed limitations:

The claimed sensor dome including a sensor within said housing and positioned within said container for monitoring conditions within said container is met by the housing containing the sensors that are used to monitor conditions of the trailer (col. 3, lines 26-67 and col. 4, lines 17-42);

The claimed external status indicator in communication with said sensor positioned within said housing on an exterior of said container side, said status indicator signaling a current security status within said container based on signal output of said sensor is met by the strobe light that is connected to the alarm module and is operative to be activated when a sensor is triggered (col. 3, lines 38-67 and col. 4, lines 17-42);

The claimed indicator having a first condition signaling a secured status and a second condition signaling a breached status is met by the strobe light being off when

the container is secure and being activated when a sensor has been triggered (col. 3, lines 38-67);

The claimed external status indicator providing a visual signal to an inspector on the exterior of the container indicating an unbreached and a breached container is met by the strobe light being off when the container is secure and being activated when a sensor has been triggered (col. 3, lines 38-67).

However, Mayor does not specifically disclose the claimed structure of the device being all contained in a singular housing, mounted through the side wall of a container with the indicator located on the outside of the container and the sensor located on the interior end of the housing inside the container. Alton teaches a trailer container sensing system that is mounted through the sidewall of the container with an indicator on the outside and a sensor located on the interior of the housing which is on the inside of the container as shown in figures 1 and 3 (abstract). Modifying the device of Mayor to consolidate all the components into a singular housing that is mounted through the sidewall of the container would reduce the costs of installation because only one part would need to be installed instead of multiple. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device disclosed by Mayor according to the teachings of Alton to use the particular housing and mounting arrangements taught.

Regarding claim 12, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed sensor device including a central processing unit associated with said sensor

and status indicator, said processing unit being operative to monitor signals sent by said sensor, comparing said signals against a norm and sending signals to said status indicator indicating breach and no breach of said container interior is met by the alarm module being connected to the sensors and external indicators and controlling the operation of each (Mayor: col. 3, lines 38-67).

Regarding claim 13, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed sensor device wherein said status indicator includes a port communicating with a wireless device, said port sending said breach and no breach signals to said wireless device is met by the pager receiving signals indicating the alarm module being triggered (Mayor: col. 4, lines 59-67 and col. 5, lines 1-6). The signals indicating no breach would have been obviously shown at the pager device by the pager device not indicating a breach when there isn't a breach detected at the alarm module.

Regarding claim 14, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed sensor device wherein said breach signal includes data indicating type of breach and time of breach is met by the alarm module recording and transmitting the type of event that caused the alarm module to be triggered and the time of the event that is recorded (Mayor: col. 9, lines 30-67, col. 10, lines 29-67 and col. 11, lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 15, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed sensor device wherein said breach signal includes data indicating location of

said container at the time of said breach is met by the alarm module querying GPS satellites to get information regarding the location of the alarm module at the time the alarm module was triggered and sending the location information to a remote monitoring system (Mayor: col. 9, lines 5-23).

Regarding claim 16, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed sensor device wherein said wireless device comprises one of a palm pilot, a laptop and a desk top is met by the event information being downloaded by a PDA or a laptop computer (Mayor: col. 9, lines 58-67).

Regarding claim 17, Mayor discloses the following claimed limitations:

The claimed providing a housing with an exterior monitor and an interior monitor is met by the alarm system with both unauthorized connect sensors and door sensors (column 3, lines 38-54);

The claimed causing said interior monitor to sense between secure condition and breached condition within said container and to send signals in response to said conditions is met by the sensors monitoring the condition of the container and being connected to the alarm module that is activated when the condition of the container is sensed to be in a non-secure condition (column 3, lines 38-54 and 64-67);

The claimed providing a central processing unit within said housing in communication with said interior and exterior monitors which receives signals from said interior monitor indicating secure and breached conditions within said container is met

by the alarm module being connected to the sensors that monitor the condition of the container and being alerted when the condition of the container is sensed to be in a non-secure condition (column 3, lines 38-54 and 64-67);

The claimed providing said exterior monitor with a plurality of signaling elements and activating selected of said elements in response to secure signals from said central processing unit and activating other of said elements in response to breached signals from said central processing unit is met by the strobe light activation (column 4, lines 17-42, column 3, lines 28-54 and 64-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use multiple lights to indicate separate secure and non-secure conditions as it is well known to use different colored lights for alarm (e.g. red) and non-alarm (e.g. green) conditions;

The claimed step of when the container is in a secured condition a first signal is continuously provided indicating said container is in a secured condition and when said container is in a breached condition a second signal is continuously sent indicating said container is in said breached condition is met by the sensors alerting the alarm module when a non-secure condition has been detected (column 3, lines 38-54 and 64-67).

However, Mayor does not specifically disclose the claimed structure of the device being all contained in a singular housing, mounted through the side wall of a container with the indicator located on the outside of the container and the sensor located on the interior end of the housing inside the container and positioning said housing to extend through an exterior surface of said container so that said interior monitor is positioned within the interior of said container and said exterior monitor is positioned outside said

container. Alton teaches a trailer container sensing system that is mounted through the sidewall of the container with an indicator on the outside and a sensor located on the interior of the housing which is on the inside of the container as shown in figures 1 and 3 (abstract). Modifying the device of Mayor to consolidate all the components into a singular housing that is mounted through the sidewall of the container would reduce the costs of installation because only one part would need to be installed instead of multiple. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device disclosed by Mayor according to the teachings of Alton to use the particular housing and mounting arrangements taught.

Regarding claim 18, the claim is interpreted and rejected as claim 3 stated above.

Regarding claim 19, The claimed providing independent visual indicators for said exterior monitor is met by the strobe light activation (Mayor: column 4, lines 17-42, column 3, lines 28-54 and 64-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use multiple lights to indicate separate secure and non-secure conditions as it is well known to use different colored lights for alarm (e.g. red) and non-alarm (e.g. green) conditions;

Regarding claim 20, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed method including providing satellite communication and monitoring the location

of said container is met by the container having satellite communications and GPS capabilities to track the alarm module location (Mayor: col. 8, lines 62-67 and col. 9, lines 1-13).

Regarding claim 21, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed method including providing a remote access device in communication with said exterior monitor which functions to record at least one of date time and location of a breach of said container is met by central monitoring center that is sent event records that record the type of event that triggered the alarm module and the time and location of the triggering event (Mayor: col. 8, lines 62-67, col. 9 lines 1-67, col. 10, lines 29-67 and col. 11, lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 22, Mayor and Alton disclose all of the claimed limitations. The claimed method including providing a remote access device in communication with said exterior monitor and said central processing unit which functions to activate, deactivate and re-set said central processing unit is met by the remote FOB that is operative to arm/disarm the alarm module unit (Mayor: col. 13, lines 20-24).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Travis R. Hunnings whose telephone number is (571) 272-3118. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel J. Wu can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TRH

DANIEL WU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
9/23/05